# REVIEW FOR APPLICABILITY OF/COMPLIANCE WITH ORDINANCES/POLICIES

## FOR PURPOSES OF CONSIDERATION OF Mansiones de Bonita, TM 5543, Log No. 07-18-003

## August 14, 2008

COMMENT TO STAFF: The Project Manager must ensure that all applicable environmental ordinances are complied with to the extent that these ordinances apply to the project.

the project.				
			<u>E</u> – Does the proposed project conford Ordinance findings?	m to the
	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT ⊠	
Discussion:				
of the Multiple	Species Cons	ervation Prog	provements are located within the bour gram. Therefore, conformance to the ce findings is not required.	
			ect conform to the Multiple Species gation Ordinance?	
	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT	
Discussion:				
within the bou	indaries of the the the Multiple S	Multiple Spec pecies Conse	provements related to the proposed procies Conservation Program. The projection Program and the Biological Middings dated August 14, 2008.	ect
	WATER ORDIN O County Grour		es the project comply with the requirent nance?	nents of
	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT ⊠	
Discussion:				

The project will obtain its water supply from the Sweetwater Authority Water District which obtains water from surface reservoirs and/or imported sources. The project will not use any groundwater for any purpose, including irrigation or domestic supply.

### IV. RESOURCE PROTECTION ORDINANCE - Does the project comply with:

The wetland and wetland buffer regulations (Sections 86.604(a) and (b)) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT
The Floodways and Floodplain Fringe section (Sections 86.604(c) and (d)) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT
The <u>Steep Slope</u> section (Section 86.604(e))?	YES ⊠	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT
The Sensitive Habitat Lands section (Section 86.604(f)) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT
The Significant Prehistoric and Historic Sites section (Section 86.604(g)) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT

#### Discussion:

#### Wetland and Wetland Buffers:

The site contains no wetland habitats as defined by the San Diego County Resource Protection Ordinance. The site does not have a substratum of predominately undrained hydric soils, the land does not support, even periodically, hydric plants, nor does the site have a substratum that is non-soil and is saturated with water or covered by water at some time during the growing season of each year.

#### Floodways and Floodplain Fringe:

The project is not located in or near a flooplain or floodway.

## Steep Slopes:

Slopes with a gradient of 25 percent or greater and 50 feet or higher in vertical height are required to be placed in open space easements by the San Diego County Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO). There are no steep slopes on the property. The project is in conformance with the RPO.

#### Sensitive Habitats:

No sensitive habitat lands were identified on the site as determined on a site visit conducted by Mark Slovick on August 9, 2007. Therefore, it has been found that the proposed project complies with Section 86.604(f) of the Resource Protection Ordinance.

#### Significant Prehistoric and Historic Sites:

Based on an analysis of County of San Diego archaeology resource files, archaeological records, maps, and aerial photographs by County of San Diego staff archaeologist, Gail Wright, it has been determined that the project site does not contain any archaeological resources.

	hed Protec		- Does the project comply witater Management and Discha	
	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE	
Discussion:				
		•	n received March 10, 2008 w nd in compliance with the WP	
			ect comply with the County of e County of San Diego Noise	
	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE	

#### Discussion:

Even though the proposal could generate potentially significant noise levels (i.e., in excess of the County General Plan or Noise Ordinance), the following noise mitigation measures are proposed to reduce the noise impacts to applicable limits:

Staff has completed the review of the Bonita Park Associates project TM5543 and the Acoustical Site Assessment report prepared by Investigative Science and Engineering, Inc. (ISE) received on March 10, 2008. Project consists of a 5 lot residential subdivision. Based on the noise report, future traffic noise levels at ground level receptors will range as high as 63.2 dBA CNEL at Lot 5 to 64.7 dBA CNEL at Lot 1. Project is subject to the County Noise Element 4b, sound level requirement of 60 dBA CNEL to Noise Sensitive Land Uses (NSLUs). Mitigation is required and can be achieved by construction of noise mitigation measures consisting of two six (6') foot high sound walls. The six (6') foot high sound walls shall run along the proposed top of slop of the southern property line of Lot 1 and Lot 5 facing Sweetwater road. Implementation of the recommended sound attenuation walls will reduce these noise impacts to as high as 53.7 dBA CNEL at Lot 5 and 57.8 dBA CNEL at Lot 1. Please refer to Section: Future Traffic Noise Impacts, Table 2, and Figure 6 for the detailed results of the noise calculations and the location of the recommended sound wall mitigation. Additionally, the location of the future traffic second story 60 dBA CNEL contour line includes portions of Lot 1 and Lot 5. Staff recommends a Noise Protection Easement over a portion of Lot 1 and Lot 5. Therefore, implementation of the two recommended six (6') foot high sound mitigation walls and dedication of a Noise Protection Easement will ensure the project will not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element and will not exceed County Noise Standards.